REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 14 December 2005. Responsive to the Official Action, Claims 7 and 17 have been canceled from this case without prejudice or disclaimer, and Claims 1, 8, and 16 have been amended for further prosecution with the other pending Claims.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 - 6 and 12 - 16under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stolz et al. (U.S. Patent 6,226,184) in view of Vanek et al. (U.S. Patent 6,566,879

Also, in the Official Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 7 – 9 and 17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that these Claims 7 - 9 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The allowance of Claims 7-9 and 17, if rewritten in independent form, is Accordingly, Claims 7 and 17 have been acknowledged and appreciated. cancelled without prejudice to incorporate the subject matter thereof in Independent Claims 1 and 16 respectively. It is believed that, by this Amendment, Independent Claims 1 and 16, containing now the allowable subject matter of Claims 7 and 17, respectively, are allowable; and the same is respectfully requested.

MR2561-129

Serial Number: 10/628,334

Reply to Office Action dated 14 December 2005

Claims 2 - 6, 8 - 9, and 12 - 15, are dependent upon a patentable base Claim 1, and therefore are allowable for at least the same reason.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

morton 9. Voul

Morton J. Rosenberg Registration #26,049

Dated: 3/6/06

Suite 101 3458 Ellicott Center Drive Ellicott City, MD 21043 (410) 465-6678 Customer No. 04586